

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the Application of: **Takeshi Kawamura et al.**

Art Unit: **3746**

Application Number: **10/563,255**

Examiner: **T. D. Jacobs**

Filed: **June 9, 2006**

Confirmation Number: **8674**

For: **EVACUATION APPARATUS**

Attorney Docket Number: **053549**

Customer Number: **38834**

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

November 18, 2011

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants thank Examiner Jacobs for courteously conducting an interview with Applicants' representative on October 7, 2011. In the interview, regarding the rejection of claim 1 over Kuramoto in view of Hall, the following was discussed:

Kuramoto teaches single- stage rotors booster pump to keep the temperature high so as not to permit reaction product to be solidified and deposited in the booster pump. This is because the use of single stage rotors as compared to multistage rotors in the booster pump increases the temperature. The intended purpose of Kuramoto is to avoid the deposition of the reaction product in the booster pump by increasing the temperature of the booster pump. It was discussed that Kuramoto teaches away from using multistage pump rotors in the booster pump, because use of the multistage pump rotor hinders the achievement of the intended purpose of Kuramoto.

Also, it was discussed that Hall (USP 6,708,981) does not teach a booster pump as recited in amended claim 1. Hall discloses a pressure intensifier 70 which "increases the pressure of the leakage gas from the reservoir 50" and is capable of "pressure intensification up to about 50 bar." See column 4, lines 7 to 9 and lines 44 to 45. The pressure intensifier 70 is not the vacuum pump, but a compressor. Therefore, "the pressure intensifier 70" does not fall within the definition of the booster pump of claim 1. Moreover, according to amended claim 1, the booster pump has a pair of multistage Roots-type pump rotors comprising an inlet-side rotor and an outlet-side rotor, and an axial width of said inlet-side rotor is larger than an axial width of said outlet-side rotor. Hall also does not teach or suggest these limitations. Also, it was discussed that the teaching away would have deterred a person of ordinary skill from combining the references in the manner proposed by the Office.

In view of the foregoing, it was agreed that amended claim 1 overcomes the rejection. Applicants earnestly thank Examiner Jacobs for expediting prosecution of the application.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

/Robert Y Raheja/

Robert Y. Raheja  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 59,274  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

RYR/bam